

Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

C. & P. 213; Reid v. Hodgson, 1 Cranch C. C. 491, Fed. Cas. No. 11, 667; Reyburn v. Belotti, 10 Mo. 597; Titford v. Knott, 2 Johns. Cas. (N. Y.) 211. A member of a family is qualified by reason of his knowledge of family correspondence in which he had no part. Tuttle v. Rainey, 98 N. C. 513, 45 S. E. 475."

Inns and Innkeepers—Distinction between "Innkeeper" and "Boarding House Keeper."—Plaintiff engaged a room at the Standish Hotel at Portland, Or., on January 16, 1915, and occupied the same until April 4, 1915, and afterward, on April 18, 1915, he again engaged another room and occupied it until March 18, 1917, paying a fixed monthly rental. During this later period his room was forced open, and three suits of clothes and other property were stolen. He brought an action to recover for the loss of his clothing. His right to recover turned upon whether he occupied the relation of a "guest" or "lodger."

The Supreme Court of Oregon (McIntosh v. Schops, 180 Pacific Reporter, 593), in reversing a judgment for plaintiff and directing a nonsuit, points out the distinction between an "innkeeper" and "boarding house keeper" in an interesting opinion by Judge Bennett. The opinion states:

"The distinction at common law between an innkeeper and a boarding or lodging house keeper was that the innkeeper catered to the traveling public—the transient traveler, who, in passing through the country, stopped from day to day in the pursuit of his travels. The lodging house or boarding house keeper, on the other hand, took care of more permanent customers, who remained for longer periods, and more or less permanently, in the same place.

"The innkeeper has always been held to a very high degree of responsibility, and if the property of his guest was stolen while under his roof, even without his fault, he was generally liable therefor. But it seems well established that before he incurred this strict liability it must appear, not only that he was an innkeeper or hotel keeper, but also that the party he was entertaining should sustain the relationship of 'guest.' The same innkeeper, who sustained that relationship to such as were 'guests,' might be only a lodging or boarding house keeper as to other persons who were staying with him permanently, and were not therefore 'guests,' within the technical meaning of the word."

Because the plaintiff's occupancy of the room was of a permanent nature, at a fixed rental, he was held to be a lodger and his right to recover denied.

Taxation—Salary of Federal Judges.—In Evans v. Gore, 40 Sup. Ct. Rep. 550 the Supreme Court (Mr. Justice Holmes dissenting)